

**REMARKS**

**Amendments**

Claims have been amended for clarity, proper antecedent basis and consistency of expressions.

The amendments in Claim 54 are supported by [0080] and original Claim 26.

The amendments in Claim 55 are supported by [006].

The amendments in Claim 58 are supported by Paragraph [0080] and Claim 57.

New Claims 59, 60 and 61 are supported by Claims 6, 12 and 35, respectively.

New Claim 62 is supported by Paragraph [0043].

No new matter is introduced. The Examiner is requested to enter the amendments.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112, second paragraph**

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

Claim 12 has been amended to overcome the rejection.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102(b)**

Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Wang et al (Journal of the American Chemical Society, Vol. 92, No. 7, pp. 1935-1939, 1970).

In Claim 20, at least one of  $R^1$  and  $R^2$  is  $R_f-A$ - (wherein  $R_f$  is a fluorinated alkyl or aryl or a fluorinated polymeric or oligomeric moiety and A is absent, oxygen or an alkylene chain). However, the compound referred to by the Examiner in Wang et al has both positions corresponding to  $R^1$  and  $R^2$  of the present Formula 7 being methyl groups.


Accordingly, the dye stabilizers of Claims 20 and 21 are not anticipated by Wang et al.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that the application is now in good and proper condition for allowance. Early notification of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 22, 2006

  
Viola T. Kung (Reg. No. 41,131)

**HOWREY LLP**  
2941 Fairview Park Drive  
Box 7  
Falls Church, VA 22042  
Ph. (650) 798-3570